

SLAVERY AND THE WAR.

ART. IV.—*L' Abolition de l' Esclavage*. Par AUGUSTIN COCHIN, ancien Maire et Conseiller de la Ville de Paris. Paris : Jacques Lecoffre. 1861. 2 Tomes. 8vo.

THE reasons assigned for not being able to review the excellent work of Pere Valroger, apply with equal force against our ability to review, as its merits deserve, the admirable work, by our highly esteemed friend, M. Augustin Cochin, on *The Abolition of Slavery*, which he has recently published, and of which he has done us the honor to send us a copy. We have, however, so far violated the strict injunctions of our physician as to look at a few of its pages, enough to enable us to judge of its general character, and to pronounce it a work of rare merit.

The first volume gives the result of the abolition of slavery by France and England in their Colonies, and establishes the fact that it has been effected without ruin and without disturbance. A storm, an insect, a year of drought would, in a material point of view, have caused more evil ; while, in a moral and religious point of view, the good has been immense, although few precautions had been taken to secure it. The second volume is devoted to the United States, Holland, Brazil, the Spanish and Portugese Colonies, the slave trade, Africa, and the influence of Christianity on slavery. We have noticed a few trifling inaccuracies in regard to our own country. The author reckons Wisconsin among the Slave States ; but we are happy to say that Wisconsin is not only a Free State, but one of the most decided anti-slavery States in the Union. He says New York was originally settled by Germans—it was originally settled by the Dutch from Holland, who are not usually called Germans by us, though of the Germanic family. Maryland was not colonized by *Irish* Catholics, but by *English* Catholics and Protestants. George Calvert had an Irish title, but was himself an Englishman. These errors, however, are very slight, and detract nothing from the real value of the work. As far as we have been able to read it, we have found the views of the author very just, philanthropic, liberal, and truly Christian. Two abler or more intensely interesting volumes on the subject of the abolition of slavery, it has not been our good fortune to meet ; and they are creditable in the highest degree to the ability, industry, and noble sentiments of their distinguished author.

The question of the abolition of slavery is becoming with us a practical question in a sense it has never before been. The Rebellion of the Slave States, which has for its object, not so much the dissolution of the Union, or the separation of the South from the North, as the reconstruction of the Union on the basis of slavery, or, as the Vice-President of the Confederate States has it, with "slavery as its cornerstone," and therefore the extension of slavery over the whole country, cannot fail to force this question upon the grave attention of every citizen of the loyal States, who loves his country, and believes in the practicability of freedom. The Slave States, by their rebellion and war on the Union, are compelling us to regard this question as one which must soon be practically met, and are forcing all loyal citizens to make their election between the preservation of the Union and the preservation of slavery. This, whatever the Federal administration, whatever individuals or parties in the Free States, with, or without Southern or pro-slavery proclivities, may wish or desire, is pretty soon to be the inevitable issue of the terrible struggle in which our glorious, and hitherto peaceful Republic is now engaged. Perhaps, at the moment we write, the last of August, a majority of the people of the Free States may not only shrink from this issue, but even honestly believe it possible to avert it altogether. The bare suggestion of the abolition of slavery may shock, perhaps, enrage them; but events march, and men who mean to be successful, or not to be left behind, must march with them. Another disaster, like that of Bull Run, or another unsuccessful action, like that of Wilson's Creek, where the brave and noble-hearted Lyon fell, a martyr to the cause of his country, and a victim to the failure of his government to send him timely aid, will do much to change the feelings and convictions of the loyal citizens of the Free States, and, perhaps, force them to give up the last hope or thought of preserving both the Union and the institution of slavery. It requires, however chary our public men may be even of whispering it, no extraordinary sagacity or foresight to perceive that, if the present war is to be continued, and the integrity of the nation restored and maintained, the war can hardly fail to become a war of liberation, or that the Northern blood and treasure, which it demands for its successful prosecution, will demand in return, as their indemnification, the emancipation of the slave, and the universal adoption for the South as well as the North of our Free Labor System.

We need not say, for the fact is well known to our readers, that no man, according to his ability and opportunity, has, since April, 1838, more strenuously opposed the abolition movement in the Free States than we have; not because we loved slavery, or had any sympathy with that hateful institution, but because we loved the Constitution of the Union, and because we believed that liberty at home and throughout the world was far more interested in preserving the union of these States under

the Federal constitution, than in abolishing slavery as it existed in the Southern section of our common country. But we believe, and always have believed, that liberty, the cause of free institutions, the hopes of philanthropists and Christians, both at home and abroad, are more interested in preserving the Union and the integrity of the nation, than they are or can be in maintaining negro-slavery. If we have opposed abolition heretofore because we would preserve the Union, we must, *a fortiori*, oppose slavery whenever, in our judgment, its continuance becomes incompatible with the maintenance of the Union, or of our nation as a free republican state.

Certainly we said in the article on *The Great Rebellion* in our last Review, the North has not taken up arms for the destruction of negro-slavery, but for the maintenance of the Federal government, the enforcement of the laws, and the preservation of the Union. This is true. The liberation of the slave is not the purpose and end of the war in which we are now engaged. The war is a war against rebellion, an unprovoked and wicked rebellion, engaged in by the Rebels for the purpose of making this a great Slaveholding Republic, in which the labor of the country shall be performed by slaves, either black or white; and if, to defeat the Rebellion, the destruction of slavery be rendered necessary and be actually effected, it will change nothing in the character or purpose of the war. It will have been necessitated by the Rebellion, and the Rebels will have only themselves to thank for the destruction or abolition they force us to adopt in defense of liberty, the Union, and the authority of the government.

The real question now before the loyal States is not, whether the Rebellion shall be suppressed by force of arms, or a peaceful division of the country into two separate and independent Republics submitted to. Any one who has any knowledge of the plans and purposes of the Rebels, knows well, that the division of the territory of the Union into two independent Republics is far short of what they are aiming at. The leaders of the Rebellion, they who planned it, they who have stirred it up, and armed it against the Union, have worked themselves into the conviction, that slavery is not to be looked upon as an evil, under certain circumstances to be tolerated, but as a good to be desired, which religion and humanity require not only to be perpetuated, but extended the farthest possible. Their doctrine is, that liberty is not practicable for a whole people, that it is practicable only for a class or a race; and that republicanism can subsist and be practically beneficial, only where the laboring class is deprived of all political and civil rights, and reduced to slavery. Their plan, their purpose is, the reconstruction of the Federal government in accordance with this theory, not merely to cut themselves loose from all companionship with the non-Slaveholding States of the North and North-West. They propose to extend slavery over the whole Union, and, in those States where negroes cannot be

profitably employed as laborers, to reduce, perhaps gradually, but ultimately and effectually, to the condition of slaves, the present class of free white laborers, who in the Free States are, to a great extent, Irish and Germans, by birth or immediate descent.

The reconstruction of the Union on the basis of slavery is the real aim of the chiefs of the Southern Rebellion, which reconstruction would give them a government similar in its essential features to that of ancient pagan Rome, and a government, if the States held together, prepared for future conquest. The Union reconstructed, it could proceed to the conquest of Mexico and Central America, and reduce their negro and colored populations to slavery, which would be counted their Americanization. This done, it could proceed, beginning with Cuba, to the annexation, one after another, of the West India Islands. It then could extend its power over the whole continent of South America, and threaten an advance upon Eastern Asia, and the annexation of all the cotton-producing countries and tropical regions of the globe, and through the monopoly of cotton, rice, and tropical productions in general, to obtain the control of the commerce and credit of all nations. Such, to a greater or less extent, is the dream which Southern statesmen have indulged, and which they have taken the first step toward realizing. In its full extent no sane man supposes the dream practicable; but its practicability, up to a certain point, has been demonstrated by the success which has hitherto attended the Rebellion, for, up to the present, successful it undeniably has been. The Confederates have brought into the field a more effective, if not a larger force, than the Federal government has thus far brought against them; and, from the Potomac to the Mississippi, they hold the strategic lines, and can be met by the Federal forces only at great disadvantage. As yet not one of those lines has been wrested from them.

Now, suppose we adopt the policy urged upon us by the peace-makers, traitors, and cowards of the loyal States, consent to a peaceful division of the United States, and recognize the Southern Confederacy as a separate and independent nation, what would be the result? Two comparatively equal independent Republics, existing side by side? Not at all. Spread out the map of the United States before you, and see which Republic would have the advantage in territory, soil, climate, productions, and all the sources of national wealth, strength, and material greatness. You would give to the Southern Republic full three-fourths of the whole territory of the Union; for the South would consent to no division now, that did not include the States of Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, and all the territory South of the line running due west from the north-west angle of Missouri to the Pacific. You would give up to the South, to what would then be a foreign power, the whole Gulf coast, and the whole Atlantic coast, except the narrow strip from the Penobscot to the Delaware. You would leave the North

a majority of the present population of the country, and nominally the superiority in wealth, it is true: but as the present superior numbers and wealth of the North depend chiefly on our superiority in commerce and manufactures, their superiority could not be long maintained. The Southern Republic, producing raw materials consumed chiefly in Europe, would be a great exporting Republic, and would naturally, in its policy, favor exports to European markets. From those markets where it disposes of its raw materials, it could, by means of a lower tariff on imports than the Northern Republic could afford to adopt, more easily and cheaply supply its own demand for imports than it could from our Northern markets. It would thus drive our manufactures from its markets, and, by importing from abroad for itself, greatly diminish our manufactures, and at the same time both our foreign and domestic trade. In addition, we should not only lose our Southern market for our imports and manufactures, but should hardly be able to keep our own. Imports would seek Southern ports, and, in spite of any possible cordon of custom-houses and custom-house officers, would find their way into all the border States of the Northern Republic and up the Mississippi and Ohio into the great States of the West and the North-West, to the most serious detriment of our own trade and manufactures, and consequently to the retention of our relative superiority in wealth and population. In spite of our industry and our enterprise, we should soon find ourselves in a state far inferior in wealth and numbers to our Southern neighbor.

Moreover, the great agricultural States of the Mississippi Valley, finding the natural outlets for their productions held by a foreign power, and themselves unable to wrest them from it, would be compelled by their own interests to secede from the Northern Republic, and to join the Southern Confederacy. The secession of these, which would be followed by that of all the States west of the Rocky Mountains, would necessarily compel the secession of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, and their annexation to the same Confederacy. This would reduce the Northern Republic to the New England States; two of which, Connecticut and Rhode Island, would, most likely, follow New York, and there would remain for the Northern Republic only the State of Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, which could escape absorption in the Confederacy only by its refusal to accept them, or by joining with the Canadas and the other British Provinces, and coming again under the British crown. Such would be the inevitable result of the proposed peaceful division of the United States, and the formation of two separate and independent Republics out of their territory, if the Southern Confederacy held together; and such is substantially the plan of reconstruction contemplated by the Southern statesmen, as is evident from their leaving their Confederacy open to the accession of new States; as was avowed in this city, last December by

Mr. Senator Benjamin, now the Attorney-General of the Confederate States ; and as asserted openly by Southern sympathizers everywhere at the North. All this is notorious, and is only what any man accustomed to reason on such subjects, and familiar with the geography, soil, and productions of the Union, sees must and would inevitably result from the policy recommended by our peace-men, cowards, and traitors.

But peace, even on as favorable terms as we have supposed, cannot now be made. Six months ago, perhaps it might have been ; but now, flushed with their recent successes, in possession of the principal strategic lines, and able to prosecute the war with more vigor than we have yet shown, the Rebels will entertain no question of peace short of our subjugation, or, what is the same thing, disbandment of our armies and quiet submission to the principles and theory on which their Confederacy is founded. Look at the question as we will, we have now no alternative but to subdue the Rebels or be subjugated by them. We must either depose that Confederacy, and enforce the authority of the Federal Government over all the rebellious States, or it will enforce its authority over the Free States, and impose upon them its System of Slave Labor. If it enforces its authority over us, there may still, perhaps, be liberty for a class or caste, but our laboring classes will no longer be freemen ; they will be placed on a level with the negro slave on a Southern plantation. For the Christian Commonwealth founded by our fathers, toiled for, and bled for, we shall have re-established a Pagan Republic more hostile to the rights of man and the rights of nations, than was ever pagan Greece or pagan Rome. We put it to our Christian countrymen, if such is the Commonwealth their fathers fought and suffered through the long Seven-Years War of the Revolution to establish, and if they can be contented to let the hopes of liberty in the New World set in a night of blackness and despair.

We know very well that we have fallen far below the virtues that founded this Republic, and gained this New World to civilization ; we know that a long career of uninterrupted prosperity and unbounded luxury has done much to corrupt us ; we know that the labor in one-half of the Republic being performed by slaves, and a greater part in the other half performed by emigrants from foreign countries, has caused a lamentable forgetfulness of those principles of liberty so dear to our fathers, and produced amongst us a laxity of principle, an indifference to law, a disregard for personal rights and personal independence, without which no republic can long subsist and prosper ; but we are not yet willing to believe that we have fallen so low, become so corrupt, so indifferent to liberty, or so dead to all moral considerations, as to be prepared to submit, for the sake of gain, or of preserving our manufactures, without a struggle to the indignities the Southern Confederacy would heap upon us, or to the adoption of the base and inhuman principle on which that Confederacy is avowedly founded. If we retain anything of

our manhood, or any memory of the Christian virtues of our ancestors, we can never submit to be slaves ourselves, or take part in reducing any portion or class of our fellow-men to slavery. If there is any virtue left in us, we must resolve that we will be free ourselves, and do all in our power to secure freedom to all other men, whether white or black, yellow or copper-colored. If we do not, we are indeed "degenerate sons of noble sires," and deserve, as we shall receive, the scorn and derision of the whole world. Political and party leaders, greedy for the "pickings and stealings" of office, who are innocent of ever having entertained a statesmanlike idea or a moral conception, may cry, like the false prophets whom the Lord, in Holy Scripture, rebukes, "Peace, peace," and seek to embarrass the government and give aid and comfort to its enemies; but we hope there is still virtue enough left in the people of the loyal States to estimate them at their true value, and to treat with indignation and scorn their counsels. Whatever the result of the contest, the vocation of these leaders is gone; and the best use to which you can put a man who now cries out for "peace," for "compromise," for "submission," and charges the Government with having provoked an "unholy and unnecessary" war, is to treat him as loyal Union men in the South are treated by the Confederates. Such men, whatever their pretensions, are really traitors, and deserve a traitor's doom; or, if not traitors, they are idiots and lunatics, and should be provided for in asylums. It is no time to mince our words, or to study out honeyed phrases; we must call things by their right names, and treat all who are not for us, as against us. We have something more than even the Constitution and laws to maintain; the very existence of the nation is at stake; and, as no means are scrupled at to destroy it, we have the right to use all the means which the law of self-preservation renders necessary or expedient.

We wish our readers and the public at large to understand that we are in war, and to let it get through their heads that the war which the Rebellion has forced upon us, is no mimic war, is no child's play, and is not to be conducted to a successful issue on the principle of treating the Rebels as friends, giving them every advantage, and doing them no harm. They are in downright earnest, and are putting forth all their strength, and doing their best to subjugate us; and we also must be in downright earnest, put forth all our strength, and do our best to subjugate them. War cannot be conducted on peace principles, or successfully conducted by men who do not enter into it with spirit, resolution and energy. We have no disposition to censure the civil or military authorities of our country; they have labored under great embarrassments, and have had no ordinary difficulties to contend with; but we must be excused, if we say that as yet they have given us little evidence of their being in earnest, or of their believing in the reality and important character of the war. Up to the disaster of Bull Run, military operations seem to have been

conducted in subordination to the projects of politicians and the especial benefit of contractors. The war was apparently treated as a secondary affair, a mere bagatelle, or a toy for children to amuse themselves with; in scarcely an instance was it treated as a grave affair, demanding for its prosecution the whole strength and energy of the country. Some doubted if the South would really fight, and it seemed to many, that all we needed to rout their armies, suppress rebellion, and re-establish over the seceded States the authority of the Federal Government, was a large number of regiments having no existence except on paper or in the imagination of those who wished to sport the epaulettes of a Colonel. This delusion has passed away. But still, at the time we are writing, it has hardly got through our heads that we are really engaged in war, and a war involving the very life or death of the nation. The mass of those who really believe we are in war, still think the war is one that may be carried on without any serious detriment to our ordinary avocations or pleasures, and one not likely to come home to our own bosoms and business. Very few of us see that everything we hold dear in this world is at stake, and that we have to struggle not only to defeat a foreign enemy, but to defend our own firesides and altars, our own wives and children, and our own personal liberty. Country gone, all is gone; and unless we become more in earnest than we have hitherto been, and put forth a civil and military force and energy which we have not yet displayed, nor judged it necessary to display, our country cannot be preserved.

We cheerfully concede that much allowance is to be made for the Administration, in the novel and unexpected position in which it has been placed. With no preparation to meet a rebellion on a formidable scale, with doubts as to how far the patriotism of the loyal States could be relied on, with the Army and Navy filled with traitors, or with officers at best indifferent to the cause of the Union, surrounded by weak, timid, and corrupt politicians, and the important, though subaltern, offices of the various departments of the civil government filled with men desiring success to the Rebels, and ready to use all the opportunities afforded by their position to secure that success, the Administration may be excused for having hesitated, before feeling the public pulse, to adopt the bold, energetic and decisive measures the crisis demanded. It was embarrassed by the legacy left it by its predecessor, and also by the fears, timidities, hopes and advice of the Union men in the Border States, who begged it not to be precipitate, lest it should plunge those States also into open secession. This fear of driving the Border States into secession has been from the first the bugbear of the Administration, and its chief embarrassment. It prevented it from taking, at the outset, those bold and decisive measures which would have forestalled the Rebels, and confined the Rebellion to South Carolina, Georgia and the Gulf States. Its efforts since to organize and strengthen a Union party in Western Virginia and Eastern

Tennessee, have impeded, rather than aided, its military operations, and lost it a campaign, without gaining it any real additional strength.

There is only one way of dealing with Rebels ; it is for the Government to be prompt, to strike quick and to strike hard. If it hesitates, if it temporizes, if it seeks to conciliate, or shows that it fears to strike lest the blow recoil upon its own head, it is only by a miracle that it can be saved. Its policy will be set down either to conscious weakness or to conscious wrong, and the rebels not only gain time, but what is even more important to them, they gain confidence in their own cause, which more than doubles their forces, while the friends of the Government are disheartened, rendered timid, if not alienated. A bold, energetic man at the head of the Government, one year ago, would have crushed out rebellion before it could really have come to a head even in South Carolina. A man able to create public opinion, not merely to follow it, at the head of the Government last March, would have confined the rebellion within the limits it then had, and, long before this, would have reduced Florida and Louisiana to their allegiance, and thus have broken the back-bone of rebellion, and prepared the way for its speedy and utter annihilation. Hesitation and delay in dealing with rebellion, is the worst policy possible.

That its dilatory and timid policy was on the part of the Government, a mistake, a blunder, no one can reasonably doubt. But it would be a mistake, a blunder no less fatal, for the friends of the Union to blazon it forth so as to weaken the confidence of the people in the Administration, and diminish its power for good. The President is worthy of all confidence for his honesty, integrity, and patriotism ; and, if he will rid himself of the embarrassment of political jobbers and stricksters, dismiss and visit with adequate punishment all secessionists, traitors, or lukewarm patriots in the employment of the Government, and put honest and capable men in their places, men who know their duty, and have the courage to perform it, who love their country and are ready, if need be, to sacrifice themselves for it, he may retrieve the past, recover all the ground that has been lost, conduct the war to a successful issue, and, if not precisely the man best fitted to the crisis, yet stand in American history second only to Washington, if indeed second even to Washington himself. Never had a President of the United States so glorious an opportunity to prove himself a man, a statesman, a true civil hero. He has, we are sure, the disposition, let him prove that he has the courage and ability not merely to follow public opinion, not merely to follow the people, but to go before them, and, by kindling up a resistless enthusiasm in them, lead them on to victory.

The American people, especially of the North, are a susceptible people, and can feel and respond to the force of genius as readily and as heartily as any other people on the face of the globe. No people in the world are susceptible of a deeper or more abiding enthusiasm ; no

people better appreciate the value of a good battle-cry ; and it has been a mistake on the part of the Administration, not to have better appreciated their real character. It has failed to give them that battle-cry. It has been too cold, too prosaic, and has pronounced no spirit-stirring word. Instead of kindling up the enthusiasm of the people, it has looked to the people to quicken its own. Instead of inspiring them, it has waited for them to inspire it. This has been a grave mistake. Men placed at the head of affairs, are placed there to lead, not to follow ; to give an impulse to the people, not to receive it from the people. If the Administration has life and energy, if it has ability and genius, let it no longer hesitate to use them, but put them forth in that free, bold, and energetic manner which will carry the people with them, and command victory.

We insist the more earnestly on this, because the mass of our people have so long been accustomed to sympathize with rebels, to aid and encourage revolutionists abroad, and to visit with their severest denunciations the acts of the legitimate government to suppress insurrection, to put down revolutionists, and vindicate its authority, that they cannot be rallied with much enthusiasm under the simple banner of Law and Order. Their first emotion is to sympathize with rebellion, wherever it breaks out, even though against their own government. They hold as a principle, as that on which their very national independence is based, the "sacred right" of revolution ; because they generally take it for granted that all rebels and revolutionists are the party of liberty, warring against despotism, and for the rights of man. Would you rally them and render them invincible against the foe ? You must give them another battle-cry than that of "Law and Order," or you will not stir their heart, that mighty American heart which conquered this country from the savage and the forest, proclaimed and won its independence, constituted the Union, and made the American nation one of the great nations of the earth. It is not for us, even if we were able, to give that battle-cry ; it must be given by genius in authority, and fall either from the lips of the President, or the Commander-in-Chief of our armies. Neither may as yet be prepared to utter it ; but, if this nation has a future, if its destiny is, as we have hitherto boasted, to prove what man may be when and where he has the liberty to be himself, uttered by one or the other it ere long will be, and in tones that will ring out through the whole Union, and through the whole civilized world now anxiously listening to hear it. The Union is and must be sacred to liberty. Here man must be man, nothing more, and nothing less. Slaves must not breathe our atmosphere ; and we must be able to adopt the proud boast of our Mother Country, "The slave that touches our soil is free." This is the destiny of this New World, if destiny it have, —the destiny our fathers toiled for, fought for, bled for, and to this we their children must swear to be faithful, or die to the last man.

We have spoken thus far as the American, the patriot, and the devoted defender of republican institutions; but we must be permitted also to speak as the Catholic publicist. We have, from the first, maintained, and with the fullest approbation of the Catholic authorities in this country, that Catholic morality enjoins upon all Catholics, whatever their rank or dignity, to be loyal to the legitimate government of their country, and to be ready to defend it, when called upon, at the sacrifice of their property, and even of their lives. That the Federal government is the legitimate government of the American nation, no Catholic can reasonably doubt. We may, as Catholics, lawfully resist tyranny or usurpation, but we cannot conspire to overthrow a legitimate government, which has not transcended its constitutional powers, or resist its authority without failing not only in our civil, but in our Catholic duty. The Federal government is no usurpation; it is a legitimate government; and it has never lost its legitimacy by any act of tyranny or oppression. No such act has been or can be pretended. Rebellion against it, therefore, is not only a crime, but a sin. The principle here asserted is that which we defended for years against the revolutionists in Europe, and it has been on the ground that such is the teaching of the Catholic religion, that we have repelled with indignation the charge brought against us by Know-Nothings, that Catholics are not and cannot be loyal American citizens. We have labored, in opposition to the Know-Nothings, to show that Catholics are bound by their very religion to be loyal; and we have ventured to assert that, if the Republic were threatened, or an attempt made to dismember the Union, Catholics would be the first to rush to its rescue, and the last to desert it.

The assertion we ventured has not been entirely justified. The conduct of our Catholic population, especially that of their leaders, has not wholly answered our expectations. Of the twelve journals in the English language, published in this country, and professedly devoted to Catholic interests, we can name only *The Catholic*, published at Pittsburg, and the *Tablet*, in this city, as decidedly loyal. The *Telegraph and Advocate*, published at Cincinnati, is occasionally loyal, and so also, perhaps, is the *Buffalo Sentinel*. The *Metro-politan Record* was, when last we read it, striving hard to be on both sides. All the rest are really secession sheets, and exert, whether avowedly or not, all their influence against the Federal government, and in favor of that of the Southern Confederacy; for we count every journal favorable to the Secessionists, that opposes the war, and clamors for peace. Of the clergy, the greater part of whom have been born or educated abroad, a large majority have Southern sympathies, and a portion of them, a small minority, we hope, are decidedly disloyal. The Bishop of Charleston, South Carolina, sang, we have been told, the *Te Deum* over the fall of Sumpter. Much allowance, no doubt, must

be made for bishops and priests residing in rebel States, and it would be too much to ask them to proclaim on all occasions, and under all circumstances, Union sentiments; their silence may often be excusable, and sometimes justifiable. Still they are bound by their religion to instruct their own people in their duty of fidelity to the government of the Union, and they have and can have no authority under that religion, or in consonance with it, to hold disloyal sentiments, denounce the loyal States, and sing *Te Deums* over the defeats of the government to which they owe allegiance. The Bishops both of Charleston and of Richmond appear to have done this; and, if they have done so, no reverence or respect for their Episcopal character should be allowed to excuse their treason, or make us hesitate to charge them with violating their Catholic duty, and doing all in their power to justify the Know-Nothings in their grave charges against the loyalty of Catholics. Catholic morality is as obligatory on priests and bishops as it is on laymen, and from its obligations they can neither absolve themselves, nor be absolved, even by the Pope. The right of the Supreme Pontiff to absolve from their oath of allegiance the subjects of a prince who, according to the law of God and the constitution of the realm or empire, has forfeited his right to reign, we have uniformly maintained, and still hold; but we have never maintained, and cannot maintain, that he has the right to absolve from their allegiance the subjects of a prince who holds his power legitimately, and has done nothing to forfeit his trusts; and certainly we cannot concede to simple bishops and priests a power which we do not and cannot concede to the Supreme Pontiff himself. We do not, in such a case, deny the absolving power to their chief in order to claim it for them.

But we are gratified to know that the Catholic people, moved by their loyal and patriotic instincts, are nobly redeeming their Church from the false position in which the disloyalty or mistaken policy of the majority of their journals, and a portion of their bishops and clergy, have had a tendency to place her. Though, for the most part, wedded to the Democratic party, which has brought the country to its present critical state, and bitterly prejudiced against the party that elected our present Chief Magistrate, and especially against New England Yankees, regarded by them as fanatics, bigots, and the enemies of all good, they have nobly volunteered to fill the ranks of our army, and generously shed their blood in defense of the Union. No class of American citizens have, in this respect, surpassed them, and indeed they have set an example worthy of all imitation. Catholics have, considering their numbers, more than their proportion in the regular army and volunteer forces of the Union, and Catholic soldiers, whether we speak of officers or men, are surpassed by no others now in the field. The loyalty of the majority of the Catholics of the North must be held to efface the disloyalty of the few Catholics of the South; and when this war has been prose-

cuted to a successful issue, we doubt not that the loyalty of Catholics will cease to be called in question, and both Catholics and non-Catholics will mutually feel that they are citizens of a common country, and form but one political people.

That the attempt of some of the so-called Catholic journals to make Catholics believe that the so-called Confederacy is less anti-Catholic in its sympathies than the North, and that the North, when the Rebellion is suppressed, will turn its arms against Catholics, may have influenced, and may still influence a few, especially Irish Catholics, whose misfortune it often is to trust their enemies, and suspect their friends, we do not deny, and we regret it. But the notion is absurd, and always has been. The South is more infidel or pagan, and far less Christian than the North, and is and always has been, as we might expect, far more anti-Catholic, and, when not absolutely indifferent to all religion, far more bigoted than the North, if, by the North, we refer to New England. There is no part of the Union where Catholics are better treated, and suffer fewer annoyances, than in the New England States. Nowhere in New England will a Catholic priest or a Catholic layman, if a gentleman, miss the treatment due to a gentleman, whatever some of our journals may allege to the contrary.

It is, no doubt, true that Messrs. Wise and Hunter, who are secessionists, did good service to the Democratic party,—which, by the way, is not the same thing as doing good service to Catholics,—in arresting the Know-Nothing movements in Virginia; but to defeat the Know-Nothings was for them a political necessity. Had the Know-Nothings triumphed in Virginia in 1855, the chances of either of these individuals becoming a candidate for the Presidency would have been less than nothing. Their success depended on the success of the Democratic party, and that party could succeed in no non-Slaveholding State without securing the Catholic and foreign vote. Deprived of that vote, the Democratic party was, and still is, in a hopeless minority in every one of the Free States. The opposition to the Know-Nothings, therefore, no more proved a disposition on the part of Messrs. Wise and Hunter favorable to Catholics, than it proved their loyalty and devotion to the Union. The Secession leaders, no doubt, men to use Catholics in their struggle for a separate nationality, or the reconstruction of the Union; but there can be just as little doubt that, when they have gained it, they mean to proscribe them, as they have openly avowed, for they wish to perpetuate slavery, and the Catholic religion everybody knows is hostile to slavery, and the Church everywhere exerts her influence against it. There is no safety in this country for our religion but in restoring and preserving the Union, and securing the liberty of the Church not as a political grant or favor, but as one of the inherent and inalienable rights of man.

Still we regret that a certain number of Catholics, misled by their

demagogues, unite with the followers of Breckenridge of Kentucky, Bright of Indiana, Vallandigham of Ohio, and the Senators from the Border Slave States not yet in open rebellion, in opposing the war for the maintenance of the Union, and in calling upon the government to discontinue it, and to make peace at once. In this they are the dupes of pretended patriots, but real traitors, and serve the cause of rebellion more effectually than they could if its open and declared adherents. The pretence, or the belief that our difficulties could now be settled by a Convention, or compromise, or any concessions short of our absolute submission to the demands of the Rebels, is the idlest thing in the world. The time for Conventions, for compromises, or for conciliatory measures, has gone by, and no man not really in league with the Southern Rebels, no patriot, no friend of the Union, with the slightest grain of intelligence, can for a moment seriously believe in their practical utility. There never has been a time since the election of Mr. Lincoln when any conciliatory measures, or any constitutional compromises, short of a complete surrender to the demands of the Southern leaders, could have been of the slightest avail. The last Congress was disposed to go farther in the way of compromise, and to make greater concessions for the preservation of peace, than wisdom or prudence dictated. But there were no terms of compromise the seceded States would accept, short of their full and unequivocal recognition as a separate and independent nation. They openly refused to return to their allegiance, even on the adoption of the so-called "Crittenden Compromise," and declared their separation final and irrevocable, leaving it for us to go to them, but absolutely refusing to come to us. The Border State Convention, whatever may have been the honest intention of many of its members, was a mere farce; for we doubt not that it was, from the first, the intention of the leading politicians in all the Border Slave States to make common cause with their Southern brethren. The present government had exhausted all the hopes of a peaceful solution of our difficulties, before it took the step which was made the pretext for war against it. From the first, Virginia, Maryland, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Missouri were pledged, as far as their leading statesmen could pledge them, to the Southern cause, and, from the first, the question with all the Slaveholding States was separation, or the reconstruction of the Union on the basis of slavery; and we entirely mistake the temper of the Southern statesmen and of the people of the Slaveholding States, if we suppose them prepared to make peace on any other terms now. There is no Peace party, no Union party in any Slaveholding State, except, perhaps, in Missouri and Kentucky, North Carolina, and Western Virginia, on which the slightest reliance can be placed. The Union men in all the other Slave States, or sections of Slave States, not excepting Maryland, are the weak, the passive, the imbecile portion of their population. The talent, the energy, the decision, the governing capacity in all the

Slaveholding States, whether the minority or the majority, are on the side of the Secessionists, and secession has a far stronger party in every one of the Free States, than the Union has in any of the Slave States, except those already named.

There is no use of attempting to disguise the facts from our own eyes. The Slaveholding States constitute really a united people, a more firmly united people in opposition to the government than we of the Free States are in support of it. Any policy, civil or military, based on a contrary supposition will prove a blunder, and disastrous in the end to the Federal cause. The South have a fixed and definite policy, which they are enthusiastic in carrying out, and they will stop at no means, however unscrupulous, judged by them necessary to their purpose. They have chosen war, and they will accept peace, until compelled, only on their own terms. Thus far the war has been mainly a success on their part, and they are far from having exhausted all their strength. Indeed they believe they are able to sustain the war as long as we can, and to sustain it successfully to the end. Nothing is more idle, then, than to suppose that the matter can now be conciliated by politicians, or that the government, without abdicating itself, has it in its power to make peace. The government has no alternative, if it would sustain itself, and preserve the integrity of the nation, or even its own honor, but to prosecute the war, and prosecute it with all the vigor and all the forces and means it can command. For men, then, who profess to be attached to the Union, to talk of "peace," of "conciliation," of "compromises," of "conventions," is the veriest twaddle, or would be, if it were not the grossest outrage upon common sense and common decency. As we have said, all these things have gone by; and to attempt to recall them from the dead past, or to galvanize them into life, is only to betray our own stupidity or our disloyalty. No; we must fight, fight manfully to the end, and teach rebellion a lesson that it will not soon forget.

We love peace as much as any man does or can, and no man, in proportion to his means, suffers more by the present war, than we do. But the Scriptures tells us, "Follow after the things which make for peace," not peace at any price; and, now that we are in war, we insist on prosecuting it till the basis of an honorable and durable peace can be obtained. The recognition of the Southern Confederacy and disbandment of our armies would not, as we have shown, secure this peace; because the project of the Southern leaders is not merely a separation from the Union, but a reconstruction of the Union under their control on the basis of slavery. Are we asked, why not quietly submit to the reconstruction demanded? Would there not still be a union of the States under a Federal government? And suppose that it did recognize slavery, what harm in that? Nearly all the States once held slaves, and the Southern States have grown and prospered, become great and powerful with the institution of slavery, and even by it; that institution

has not only contributed to the greatness, strength, and prosperity of the South, but has been the basis of the commercial and manufacturing prosperity of the North; why, then, should the North oppose it, or hesitate to adopt it? The Union reconstructed on the basis of slavery would be far greater, more homogeneous, stronger, and more prosperous than it has ever hitherto been; and the reconstruction demanded is not merely in the interest of the South, but in the interest of the whole country; why not then accept it?—So we have found men not in a madhouse reasoning here at the North, and so, perhaps, some misguided citizens really believe.

We reply to this reasoning—1. The reconstruction proposed would be the destruction of the present Union, of the Union effected by our fathers, and indeed of the nation which it formed, hitherto symbolized by the “Stars and Stripes.” It would be the destruction of our present nation, and, at best, only the substitution of another nation in its place. Now, it so happens that many of us have an ardent attachment to the Union, in which we were born, and under which we have thus far lived, and do not choose to expatriate ourselves, or to be forced to become the subjects of another government. For ourselves, we were born an American citizen, and, wherever the vicissitudes of life may cast our lot, an American citizen we will live and we will die, and no consideration under heaven shall ever induce us to abjure allegiance to the Federal government, or swear allegiance to any other sovereign. Except for gross tyranny or oppression, we deny the right of expatriation, just as we deny the right of secession or revolution. This feeling which we express may be treated lightly by traitors, rebels, and peace-men, and sneered at as mere sentimentality; but we must be permitted to say, that, where it is wanting in any considerable number of the population of a country, there is and can be no real loyalty, no genuine patriotism, and therefore no firm support for a national government, no secure reliance for the nation in its moment of peril. To transfer our allegiance from the present Union to a new Union, not growing out of it, but established in spite of it, and on its ruins, would be to convert us into foreigners in our own country; it would wound, in its most sensitive part, the patriotism of the people, and obliterate from their hearts all sentiments of national honor and loyalty, and therefore the very condition of the existence and durability of the nation, and consequently of the reconstructed Union.

2. A nation, to be great, to be strong, and what the true patriot desires it, must have a solid foundation in truth and virtue, and aim at something higher, nobler, more spiritual, than mere material conquest, or material wealth and prosperity. Whatever Southern slaveholders or Northern merchants and manufacturers may think, there is a Moral Governor of this world, and the nation that constitutionally and habitually violates the great law of right and wrong, and contemplates only

material grandeur and material goods, either will not long subsist, or subsist only as the scourge of the nations. We want not that paganized Republic of which the Southern leaders dream, and with which they seek to allure us to union with them, even were it to become as great, as powerful, and as magnificent as was ancient Rome, once the haughty mistress of the world. Such a Republic would contribute nothing to modern civilization, nothing to the intelligence, the virtue, or the happiness of mankind. It would be at war with all Christian principles and tendencies, and could only prepare the world for a return of heathen darkness and barbarism. It would be anachronous. It would be out of place in modern society, and out of time in the progress of civilization. It would be a retrograde movement, and therefore a movement against the laws of Providence, as well as against the true interests of mankind.

3. There are some among us who still retain a conscience, and are foolish enough, if you will, to believe that all men are created equal, and have certain inalienable rights, of which civil society cannot divest them, except in punishment for crime. There are people who believe in the practicability of republican institutions, which, though not securing to all men equality of rank or condition, shall yet secure to all their native and inherent rights as men. Such people are honestly opposed to slavery, and can never, without the last struggle, submit to the formation of an aristocratic state with slavery for its corner-stone. It might have been wise and prudent to acquiesce in the institution of slavery as a local institution in some of the States of the Union, where it existed prior to the Union itself, or had since been suffered to acquire, a legal, or *quasi*-legal existence, so long as it could not be reached without doing violence to the Constitution; but it would be something very different to consent to the reconstruction of the Union on the basis of slavery, and to give it through the Constitution a legal *status*. Slavery, say what we will of it, is a great moral, social, and political wrong, and that, too, whatever be the complexion of the slave. If there be any truth in Christianity, if there be any truth in the teachings of the great Fathers and Doctors of the Church, God never gave to man the dominion of man; and hence St. Augustine, St. Gregory the Great, and others, tell us that the first rulers of mankind were called *pastors* or *shepherds*, not *lords* or *dominators*; and that God gave to mankind dominion over the irrational creation, but not over the rational. The Church has tolerated slavery, where she lacked the power to abolish it; but her whole history proves that she sets her face against it, and uses all the means at her disposal, without shocking the public peace, or creating tumults and disorder, to prepare the slave for freedom, and to secure his ultimate emancipation. The negro is a man—is a human being—a member of the human race; and, whether naturally inferior or not, to the boasted Caucasian variety, he has the same natural and

inherent right to liberty that has the white man, and the wrong of enslaving him is just as great as it would be if he were white. The laboring man, whether white or black, may be a poor man, but God has given him the right to be a free man, to be his own man, not another's.

As to the argument of our Southern slaveholders; and apologists for slavery, that the slave is better cared for, better fed, and better clothed than our poor laborers at the North, they weigh nothing with us; because they relate only to the human animal, and not to the man. If the slave were a mere animal, had no rational soul or moral nature, if he were indeed an ox, a horse, or a dog, we should not complain of his condition, or offer any objection to slavery. We believe that the *animal* in the slave is often better provided for than the animal in the poor white laboring man; but the *man* is and must be neglected. It is the *man* that is wronged and outraged, the *man* that is debased and enslaved; and the slaveholders know very well that, in order to keep their slaves in subjection, they must close to them, as far as possible, all the avenues to intelligence, debar them from all intellectual and moral culture, and keep them as near the level of brutes as they are able; they must stifle in them the *man*, and prevent the development in them of that "image and likeness" of God in which they were created. It is this that renders slavery an outrage upon humanity, and has excited against it the indignation of the whole Christian world.

We cannot, therefore, consent to the reconstruction of the Union on the basis of slavery. We believe in the rights of man; we believe in liberty; we would secure to all others that liberty which we demand for ourselves; and we believe slavery a great wrong, a sin against humanity, which is sure, sooner or later, to bring down the vengeance of God upon every people that adopts and insists on perpetuating it. The nations of antiquity had slaves; where are those nations now? Pagan Greece and Rome had their slaves; and where are Greece and Rome today? The Ottomans have had their slaves, and the Ottoman empire is now in its agony. Spain became a great slave power through her colonies. Most of those colonies has she lost, and she herself has fallen from the first power, below the rank of a second-class power of Europe. The same may be said of Portugal. Only those nations in Europe, which have emancipated their slaves, freed, or are freeing their serfs, show any signs of longevity. Let the fate of all slaveholding nations be a warning to all those weak, cowardly, or traitorous men at the North, who would consent to the reconstruction of the Union on the basis of slavery. Let them reflect that "the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God;" and every slaveholding nation, whatever its spasmodic piety, or its hypocritical professions, does forget God, who never refuses to hear and ultimately to avenge the slave.

4. Finally, passing over all thus far adduced, we cannot consent to such a reconstructed Union, because it would contain in it no element of

strength and durability, but the seeds of its own dissolution. It would be based not only on slavery as its corner-stone, but on the right of any or every State to secede, whenever it should choose, without the other States having any right to call it to an account for its secession. This recognized right of secession may work no great harm to-day, while the Confederate States are united in a grand struggle for separate existence, or national reconstruction; but the moment that struggle is over and peace is restored, it would begin to operate, and render the Confederate bond a mere rope of sand. State jealousies would spring up, and new secessions would commence; the Union would hardly be reconstructed before it would be re-dissolved into its original elements, and there be as many separate and independent governments as there are individual States. We tried confederation before constructing the Union, and found that it would not work; and the Union itself, if it has any defect, is in the fact that it leaves the Federal power too weak for an effective central power, or to constitute the people of the several States really and practically one political people. The new Confederacy would be still weaker, exaggerate this defect, inasmuch as it would recognize the right of every individual State to secede whenever it judge it for its own interest, convenience, or pleasure to do so. Is it to be hoped that the Confederacy would be conducted with so much wisdom and propriety as never to give umbrage to any State, or that disappointed and ambitious politicians in any State would never find or make a cause for dissatisfaction, and, like the politicians of South Carolina, whirl their State out of the reconstructed Union? Even now, we are told, South Carolina and Georgia are beginning to manifest symptoms of dissatisfaction with the Confederate government, and we can readily believe that, if the pressure of a common danger were removed, each of them would lose no time in raising the "Lone Star" of independence, and seceding from secession.

However attractive, then, might be the dream of a reconstructed Union on the basis of slavery, we could never hope to realize it; for we could never hope to preserve it any considerable length of time in its integrity. There would soon be disaffection at the South; there would be disaffection at the North; and there would always be disaffection in the consciences of all good men, of all true Christians in all sections, created and sustained by the moral and social plague of slavery. Here are reasons amply sufficient why we should not discontinue our efforts to preserve the Union as it is, and why we should not make peace with the Rebels on their own terms, or accept their proposition of substituting the Constitution of the Confederate States for the Constitution of the United States.

The government, we insist, had no alternative in the outset but to abdicate itself, or to resist the rebellious movements with all the forces at its command. It has no other alternative now, and the men who would urge upon it any other policy can be commended for their loyalty

only at the expense of their intelligence. The only fault of the government has been in having too long pursued a conciliatory policy, in having delayed too long the necessary measures to vindicate its own dignity and authority, in adopting timid and half-way measures, and in having prosecuted the war with too little vigor, and with too great tenderness toward the Rebels. But it is no time now to call up its past delinquencies, and parade them before it. Nothing remains for it but to let the past go, and henceforth treat secession as rebellion, and the seceders and their aiders and abettors as traitors. We wish it to prove that it has the courage and the disposition to treat them as traitors, wherever it meets them, or is able to seize them. We desire it to understand that there is war, real war, downright earnest war, and a war to be conducted not on the principle of respecting the feelings of the enemy, and of doing him no harm, but on the principle of striking him where he is weakest and sorest, and availing ourselves of every advantage against him allowed by the laws of civilized warfare. The Rebels offer no advantage to us; they avail themselves of every advantage against us in their power, respect none of our susceptibilities, and take no pains not to wound our feelings; we must mete them the measure they mete. They allow in their States, where they have the power, the utterance of no Union sentiments, of no Union speeches, or Union harangues, and they hang, imprison, or banish every Union man they can lay their hands on, who keeps not his Union sentiments to himself. We must mete out a like measure to every rebel or secessionist we find in the loyal States, and silence every voice raised against the right of the government to vindicate and preserve the Union by force of arms. It is madness to send our sons and brothers to fight rebels in Virginia, Tennessee, or Missouri, while we suffer their friends, aiders, and abettors to spout their treason and disloyal sentiments here at home. It is not only madness; it is a moral wrong; it is, as some would say, worse still,—it is a blunder.

Do not tell us that this would be contrary to the Constitution and the free expression of opinion. Traitors and friends of traitors have no Constitutional rights, for they are in rebellion against the Constitution itself, and no man can stand on his own wrong. Free expression of opinion! Just as if the question between lawful authority and rebels were a question on which there could be two honest opinions! Is it a question of opinion, when a nation is engaged in a struggle for its very existence, whether its children shall support it or not? Is it a matter of opinion whether the nation shall be preserved or not? Is it a matter of opinion, when I am assaulted by an assassin, whether I have the right to resist him or not; whether I shall quietly submit to be assassinated, or snatch the dagger from his hand, and plunge it into his own heart? Have men lost their senses? Are we to argue the question whether the sun shines in the heavens or not, when we see it with our own eyes?

Down with such intolerable cant about "Constitutional liberty," and "freedom of speech or opinion!" How, if the Constitution is gone, trampled underfoot by rebels, do you expect to maintain constitutional liberty, or any other kind of liberty worth having? Understood at once that we are in war, and in a war for the preservation of the Constitution, for the preservation of liberty, political, moral, mental, civil, and social, and that it is never permitted to plead the Constitution and liberty against the measures necessary for their maintenance. Do understand, if understanding you have, that we are in war for the very existence of the nation, and that, if the nation goes, constitutions and liberty go with it. It is only by preserving the nation in its integrity and its majesty that the Constitution can be maintained, and the liberty it secures enjoyed. Neither the nation nor the Constitution can afford protection to those who would only use their liberty and the Constitution to destroy them.

The measure we suggest may be severe, and such as in ordinary cases of rebellion ought not to be resorted to by a free government. But we are engaged in suppressing no ordinary rebellion; we are engaged in suppressing a rebellion of vast proportions, of vast resources, and of strength hardly inferior to that of the loyal States themselves. We can put it down; and, God helping, we shall put it down; but not without exerting all our strength, and availing ourselves of all the means to suppress it authorized, we will not say by the Constitution, but by the recognized laws of war. War has its own laws; and, while it lasts, it overrides all other laws, and, if need be, places the Constitution itself, so far as it would be a barrier to its success, in abeyance. *Salus populi lex suprema est* is a universally received maxim, and the safety of the nation is the only law which can control military operations, or determine the measures necessary or proper in the preservation of the war.

It is all very well for your Breckenridges, your Burnetts, your Brights, and your Vallandighams, *et id omne genus*, to prate in Congress and elsewhere about the unconstitutionality of the acts of the President; we know not, and care not, whether those acts were constitutional or not, so long as we know that they were necessary to the maintenance of the Union, the majesty of law, and our national existence itself. How long must it take the petty political attorneys to learn that the nation is above the Constitution, since it makes the Constitution, and its preservation is more than the preservation of the Constitution, and therefore that all acts necessary to maintain the integrity of the nation and its authority are always lawful, authorized by the highest of all laws? Only they who uphold the Constitution, sustain the Union, and labor to save the Constitution, can plead the Constitution and laws in their favor. They who rebel, or aid and abet rebels, by their very act of rebellion put themselves out of the protection

of the Constitution and laws, and cannot demand their protection, and should not be permitted to expect that it will be extended over them. The Constitution and the laws are for loyal citizens,—not for rebels and traitors. Let, then, the measures suggested or recommended be severe, let them be such as in peaceful times, when the Constitution and laws are unresisted and everywhere cheerfully and respectfully obeyed, would be unconstitutional and indefensible, that, in times like these, when the very existence of the nation is at stake, is no objection to them. The first law of nations, as well as of individuals, is self-preservation. It is unconstitutional and illegal to hang innocent and peaceful men; but it is neither illegal nor unconstitutional to hang murderers. It is unconstitutional and illegal to shoot down innocent and peaceful men arrayed in the field before you, even though they have arms in their hands; but it is not unconstitutional or illegal to shoot them down in self-defense, or in defense of the Constitution and laws. Let us, then, hear no more about the constitutionality of this or that measure clearly necessary to the safety of the nation, and the preservation of the Union under the existing Constitution.

In a state of war every thing has to give way to military necessity, private property, liberty, and even life itself. The State may take, if its necessities demand it, the private property of its citizens to the last cent, and it can command any citizen it sees proper, to march to meet the enemy, and, if need be, and the fate of war so decide, to lay down his life, and, what is dearer than life, his liberty, for his country. On this principle the Federal government now calls for troops, and imposes heavy taxes on our property for the support of the war; and loyal citizens cheerfully respond to its call, because they know it has the right to do it, and because they know that, if the country be lost, all is lost, life, liberty, and property themselves.

A heavy tax is imposed by the present war on the citizens of the loyal States, although the war has been brought about without any fault of theirs, or any act of theirs having rendered it necessary. Are they to bear the whole burden it imposes, without any indemnification, or without any attempt, at least, to make the rebellious States, whose treachery has created the necessity for it, bear any portion of it? Shall not they who dance pay the piper? In preserving the Union, do we not do it for the benefit of the disloyal, no less than for the benefit of the loyal States; and must we, because we are loyal, bear the whole burden of preserving it? The Union has as much right to tax disloyal as loyal citizens, and to collect the tax from the disloyal in the most ready and practicable way possible. Hence Congress, at its last session, passed an act confiscating the property of disloyal citizens of the States now in rebellion, and authorizing its seizure wherever it can be found. This is only simple justice. They whose misconduct has created the war, should be made, as far as possible, to bear its burden, or to indemnify the loyal States for the expenses it compels them to incur.

But military necessity may require us to go even farther than this late Act of Congress. The laws of war and military prudence authorize us to strike the enemy where he is most vulnerable, and where the blow will inflict on him the greatest damage. No just war is ever prosecuted for the sake of war. War, for the sake of war, is in all cases unjustifiable. War is justifiable, and can be engaged in by a Christian people, only when it looks to peace for its end, or, which is the same thing, the removal of the causes which have rendered it necessary. If it may be justly resorted to, it is always lawful so to conduct it as in the speediest and most effectual manner possible to remove those causes, to redress the wrongs for which it is waged, and to bring about the desired peace. We are never morally obliged to meet the enemy on his own chosen ground, or to fight him with an equality of forces or weapons. We have the right to choose our own time, place, and mode of attack, and to choose such time, place, and mode as will be the most inconvenient or distressing to him, and the most effectually cripple his resources, crush his power, and compel him to surrender. If he has a weak spot, one weaker than another, we have not only the right, but in common prudence and common humanity are bound to seek out that spot, and there strike our heaviest and deadliest blow. Thus, if there is a disaffected party in the enemy's country, we have the right to encourage and strengthen that party. Hence the government has labored to strengthen and encourage the Union men in Western Virginia, Eastern Tennessee, Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri, and by so doing has prevented these States and parts of States from joining openly in the Rebellion. On the same principle it has a right to go farther, and make friends and allies of all classes of the population of the rebellious States that it can influence, and that, too, without reference to the condition in which they have heretofore been placed by the laws or usages of those States themselves.

This brings us to the question of the slave population in the rebellious States. In these States there are over three millions of the population held by the laws or usages of those States as slaves. These people are an integral portion of the people of the United States, owe allegiance to the Federal government, and are entitled to the protection of that government. The government has the same right to make friends and allies of them, and to enroll and arm them against the Rebellion, that it has to make friends and allies, or to enroll and arm the white population of Western Virginia or of Eastern Tennessee. It makes nothing against this that these people have heretofore been slaves by the laws or the usages of the States in which they reside; for those laws or usages are deprived of all force against the Union by the very act of Rebellion. Rebellion dissolves all laws for the protection of the life or property of the rebels. By the very act of rebellion, the rebel forfeits to the government against which he rebels both his property and his life, and holds

henceforth neither, save at its mercy or discretion. If it were not so, the government would have no right to confiscate the property of rebels, or to attempt to suppress a rebellion by force of arms. If the slaves held in the rebellious States are property, they are forfeited to the government, and the government may confiscate them, as cotton, rice, tobacco, or any other species of property found in the hands of the Rebels. The same principle that gives to the government the right to confiscate a bale of cotton owned by a Rebel, gives it a right to confiscate every negro slave claimed by a rebel master. This is perfectly clear, and is implied in the recent Act of Congress on the subject. But if these people held as slaves are not property, they are and should be regarded as citizens of the United States, owing allegiance to the Federal government, liable to be called into the service of the Union in the way and manner it deems most advisable, and, if loyal, entitled to the same protection from the government as any other class of loyal citizens. Nobody can pretend that the Federal government is obliged, by virtue of the laws or usages heretofore existing in the Slave States, to treat these people as property. Whatever might have been its obligation before the rebellious acts of those States, that obligation is now no longer in force.

But if it be required to treat them as free and loyal citizens by the military operations for the preservation of the Union, or even to remove the causes of the present rebellion, the government is bound so to treat them. The only doubt that can arise is as to the fact, whether it would or would not prove useful to this end. It may be objected to such a measure that it would deprive us of the aid of Western Virginia and Eastern Tennessee, and drive into open hostility to the Union Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri. This objection deserves grave consideration. But it is in substance the objection that has embarrassed the government from the outset, and compelled it to take only half-way measures to suppress the Rebellion. For ourselves, we cannot respect the fear to which this obligation appeals. Fear is the worst possible counsellor in the world, and the government that hesitates to adopt the best policy for fear of alienating its friends, is lost. Let the lines be at once sharply drawn between our friends and our enemies. In a crisis like the present, lukewarm friends, or friends who will be our friends only by virtue of certain concessions to their interests or prejudices, are more embarrassing than open enemies, and do more to weaken our forces than if arrayed in open hostility against us. If these States are for the Union they will insist on no conditions incompatible with the preservation of the Union; they will make sacrifices for the Union, as well as the other loyal States, and there is no reason why they should not. There is neither reason or justice in Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and the great States north-west of the Ohio, pouring out their blood and treasure for the gratification of the slave-

holding pretensions of Maryland, Kentucky, or Missouri. The citizens of these States who own slaves, are as much bound, if the preservation of the Union requires it, to give up their property in slaves, as we at the farther North are to pour out our blood and treasure to put down a rebellion which threatens alike them and us. If they love their few slaves more than they do the Union, let them go out of the Union. We are stronger to fight the battles of the Union without them, than we are with them.

But we have referred only to the slaves in the rebellious States, and, if it is, or if it becomes a military necessity to liberate all the slaves of the Union, and to treat the whole present slave population as freemen and citizens, it would be no more than just and proper that, at the conclusion of the war, the citizens of loyal States, or the loyal citizens of loyal sections of the rebellious States, should be indemnified at a reasonable rate for the slaves that may have been liberated. The States and sections of States named have not a large number of slaves, and, if the Union is preserved, it would not be a very heavy burden on it to pay their ransom; and to paying it no patriot, or loyal citizen of the Free States would raise the slightest objection. The objection, therefore, urged, though grave, need not be regarded as insuperable; and we think the advantages of the measure in a military point of view, would be far greater than any disadvantage we have to apprehend from it.

Whether the time for this important measure has come or not, it is for the President, as Commander-in-Chief of our armies, to determine. But, in our judgment, no single measure could be adopted by the government that would more effectually aid its military operations, do more to weaken the Rebel forces, and to strengthen our own. Four millions of people in the Slave States, feeling that the suppression of the Rebellion and the triumph of the Union secures to them and their children forever the *status* of free citizens, are more than a hundred thousand men taken from the forces of the enemy, and twice that number added to our own; for they would not only compel the Rebels to keep a large force, that might otherwise be employed, at home, to protect their own wives and children, but would deprive them of the greater portion of that labor by which they now subsist their armies. Now slavery is to them a source of strength; it would then be to them a source of weakness. Its abolition would, in our judgment, be striking the enemy at his most vulnerable point, precisely where we can best smother the sinews of his strength, and deal him the most fatal blow.

Moreover, it would not only bring to the assistance of the Federal arms the co-operation of the whole colored race in the Union, but would secure us, what we now lack, the sympathy and the moral aid of the whole civilized world, and remove all danger of our coming into conflict with either France or England. The war would be seen then likely to effect a result with which Englishmen and Frenchmen could sympathize,

and, instead of wishing for the success of the Southern Confederacy, they would wish with all their hearts for the success of the Federal arms. It would do more than this. It would bring to the aid of our volunteer force from one hundred to two hundred thousand brave and stalwart volunteers from the Free States, aye, and even many from the Slave States themselves, who will not, and cannot be induced to volunteer their services in a war which, even if successful, promises to leave the institution of slavery not only existing, but more firmly established than ever. Everybody knows that slavery is at the bottom of the whole controversy, and that the real object of the Southern leaders is not simply to protect slavery against abolition movements where it exists, but to extend it over the whole Union, and make the American Republic a great Slaveholding Republic. And there are men in large numbers amongst us, men who have had no sympathy with Abolitionists, who see and understand very well that, even were we successful in putting down the present rebellion, no real union between the North and the South could be restored, and that no durable peace between them could be re-established, if slavery continued to exist. These men enter not and will not enter heartily into the war, unless they see clearly and feel fully assured that it will result in the final and total extinction of slavery throughout the Union and all the territory it may now possess or hereafter acquire.

The present rebellion proves, what thoughtful and farseeing men in all sections of the Union have long seen and said, that the preservation of the Union with the Slave System of labor extending over one half of it, and the Free-Labor System over the other half, is, in the ordinary course of human affairs, an impossibility. Senator Seward, or rather Mein Herr Diefenbach in our Review before him, was right in saying there is an "irrepressible conflict" between the two Systems. They cannot long coexist together in peace and harmony; there is an irrepressible tendency in each to exclude the other; and no possible wisdom or prudence, on the part of any administration, can harmonize their coexistence under one and the same government. You must make your election between the Systems, and adopt for the whole country either the Slave System, or the Free-Labor System; and the real significance of the contest in which we are now engaged, is as to which of these Systems shall be the American system.

However homogeneous in race or character, habits or manners, may be the people of a country in the outset, they separate, and grow gradually into two distinct peoples, with almost entirely different ideas, habits and customs, if one half of them in the one section adopt the Slave System, and the other half in the other the Free-Labor System. We have already in the United States, notwithstanding our common origin, our common language, the similarity of our laws, and our habitual intercourse, grown almost into two distinct nations. The Confederates are Americans indeed, for they have been born and bred on

American soil ; but they no longer retain the original American character ; while in the Free States, bating the alterations effected by foreign immigration, that character is substantially preserved. We of the North are the same people that made the Revolution, won American Independence, and established the Federal government. This divergence showed itself even at the time of the Revolution ; and it has been growing greater and greater from the beginning of the present century ; and if the two Systems of labor are continued on American soil, must continue to grow still greater and greater, till the people of the two sections grow up into two absolutely distinct and mutually hostile nations, no longer capable, but by the subjugation of the one by the other, of existing under one and the same government. The only way this divergence can be checked, the unity and homogeneousness of the whole American people recovered and preserved, is by the assimilation of the Labor Systems of the North and the South.

We of the North cannot and ought not to accept the Labor system of the South. But the Slave States, by their unprovoked rebellion, have given us an opportunity of performing an act of long delayed justice to the negro population of the Union, and of assimilating the Southern Labor system to ours. This assimilation is at the bottom of the Southern Rebellion, and the South has risen in arms against the Union, chiefly for the purpose of extending her Labor system over all the Free States. In doing so, she gives us the right, in our own self-defense, to extend our Free-Labor System over all the Slave States,—a right which, but for her rebellion, we should not have had under the Constitution.

If this prove a disadvantage to the Southern States, owing to the peculiar character of their laboring population, they have no right to complain, for it is a disadvantage they have brought upon themselves. But this will be a disadvantage only as compared with us of the North ; for it will be better for the South herself to have her negro population free laborers, than it is to have them slaves. In counting the population of the South, we must count not merely her white, but also her black and colored population. The moral, spiritual, and material well-being of her four millions of black and colored people must be considered, as well as the moral, spiritual, and material well-being of her eight millions of whites. These black and colored people are as much human beings, whose welfare is as important and as necessary to be consulted by the statesman, the political economist, the moralist, and the Christian, as that of any other portion of her population ; and what they would gain by their emancipation should be thrown into the balance against what might be lost by their former owners. But even the three hundred and forty-seven thousand slave proprietors would, in reality, lose nothing, or gain in moral more than they would lose in material prosperity. We do not believe Southern society would, in case of emancipation, be equal to what it would if the whole population were

of the white race. The negro element would remain in that society, and, wherever it remains, it will be an inferior element; but far less so as free, than as enslaved. The white population of the South must always suffer this drawback for having collected, or submitted to the collection of a large African population on their soil, and they have no right to complain if obliged to make expiation, as long as the world stands, for having introduced and sustained the institution of negro slavery. But aside from the disadvantage of having its laboring population of a race with which the white race will not mingle, the South would gain by the assimilation of her Labor system to that of the North.

M. Augustin Cochin has proved, in the work before us, that slavery can be abolished, and the slaves converted into free laborers, without any serious detriment, even to the former slave proprietors. We all know that free labor is more economical than slave labor, and therefore that a freeman is worth more, under the point of view of national wealth, than a slave. The conversion of the four millions of slaves now in the Southern States into freemen, would very much increase, instead of diminishing, the aggregate wealth of those States; and if a portion of this increased aggregate wealth should pass from the hands of a few slave proprietors, and into the hands of those who have heretofore been allowed to hold no property, the aggregate well-being of the whole community would also be augmented instead of diminished, and therefore the South, regarded as a whole, or looking to her whole population, would be unquestionably a great gainer by the change. It would not in any respect be depopulated or impoverished, but would be in the way of a more rapid increase of its population, and of that wealth which constitutes the real strength and prosperity of a State. What we propose, then, would in no respect be ruinous, or even injurious, to the Southern States themselves, but would be a real advantage to them, and secure them after the peace all the real greatness, strength, and prosperity States with a mixed population of white and black are capable of. The proposition, then, involves no wrong, no injustice, no injury to the white population of the Southern States; while it would be an act of justice, though tardy justice, to the negro race so long held in bondage, and forced to forego all their own rights and interests for the pride, wealth, and pleasure of their white masters.

It seems to us, then, highly important, in every possible view of the case, that the Federal government should avail itself of the opportunity given it by the Southern Rebellion to perform this act of justice to the negro race; to assimilate the Labor system of the South to that of the North; to remove a great moral and political wrong; and to wipe out the foul stain of slavery, which has hitherto sullied the otherwise bright escutcheon of our Republic. We are no fanatics on the subject of slavery, as is well known to our readers, and we make no extraordinary pretensions to modern philanthropy; but we cannot help fearing that,

if the government lets slip the present opportunity of doing justice to the negro race, and of placing our Republic throughout in harmony with modern civilization, God, who is especially the God of the poor and the oppressed, will never give victory to our arms, or suffer us to succeed in our efforts to suppress rebellion, and restore peace and integrity to the Union. We have too long turned a deaf ear to the cry of the enslaved; we have too long suffered our hearts to grow callous to the wrongs of the down-trodden in our own country; we have too long been willing to grow rich, to erect our palaces, and gather luxuries around us by the toil, the sweat, and the blood of our enslaved brethren. May it not be that the cry of these brethren has already entered the ear of Heaven, and that He has taken up their cause, and determined that, if we refuse any longer to break their chains, to set them free, and to treat them as our brothers and fellow-citizens, we shall no longer exist as a nation? May it not be that, in this matter, we have Him to reckon with, and that the first step toward success is, justice to the wronged? We confess that we fear, and deeply fear, if we let slip the opportunity which the Southern Rebellion gives us to do justice to the slave, or to make his cause ours, in vain shall we have gathered our forces and gone forth to battle. We fear God may be using the Rebels as instruments of our punishment—instruments themselves to be destroyed, when through them our own destruction has been effected. We speak solemnly and in deep earnest; for he fights at terrible odds who has the infinite and just God against him. It may be that an all-wise Providence has suffered this rebellion for the very purpose of giving us an opportunity of emancipating rightfully, without destroying, but as a means of preserving, the Union, the men, women, and children now held in bondage, and of redeeming our past offenses. If so, most fearful will be His judgments upon us, if we neglect the opportunity, and fail to avail ourselves of the right. Now is our day of grace. This opportunity neglected, our day of grace may be over, and our Republic follow the fate of all others, and become a hissing and a by-word in all the earth. Which may God in His infinite mercy avert!

Since the foregoing was in type, we have seen a characteristic correspondence between the Bishop of Charleston and the Archbishop of this city, which tends to confirm what we have said of the position of Catholics in the present Rebellion. The Bishop of Charleston is, of course, a secessionist, and, like most Southern Catholics, bitterly hostile to the North, especially New England. There are a few things in the Archbishop's reply which we wish had been omitted, as tending to foster that sectional prejudice which Southern influence has but too successfully created in our Catholic population; but upon the whole it is noble and loyal, well-written and ably-reasoned, and worthy of the high character and position of its illustrious author. The argument against secession is conclusive, and his Grace fully sustains our position, that it

is the *duty* of Catholics to stand by the Union, and give, if need be, their property and lives, in its defense against the present wicked and unprovoked Rebellion. As a native-born American citizen, we thank him for his loyal expressions, and we are most grateful to him, as a Catholic, for having given the sanction of his name and position to the efforts of those in our communion who have staked their property, their reputation, and their lives even, in the noble effort to rescue the Catholic Church in the United States from the false and damaging position in which such Catholic citizens as the Bishop of Charleston and one or two others would place her. His letter is an event, and must have a marked influence on the future of Catholicity in this country and, we may say, on the country itself. It will teach Catholics that the present conflict is not a conflict between two political parties, and that the present fearful struggle in which we are engaged is not a struggle to decide whether the affairs of the country shall be administered by the Republican party or by the Democratic party, but a conflict between loyal citizens and rebels, to decide whether we have or have not a country to govern. This is the tremendous issue involved in the present struggle, and Catholics who are worthy of the name, who understand and are prepared to follow the teaching of Catholic morality in its political applications, however strongly they may heretofore have been attached to the Democratic party, or however readily they may have listened to the counsels of men who are now in arms, or sympathizing with those who are in arms, against the national authority, must give a firm and cordial support to the present Federal administration. No matter what party elected that administration, no matter whether we like or dislike the men themselves, so long as they represent the national authority, and labor to sustain the Federal Union and national integrity, we must rally to their support. In this fearful contest, party prejudices, personal preferences, and sectarian controversies must all for the time be sacrificed upon the altar of our country in the discharge of our high patriotic and Christian duties. This we should learn from the noble letter of our illustrious Archbishop, and we trust that those Catholics, if any such there are, who might refuse to listen to our reasoning and advice, will listen and heedfully follow what he declares to be the duty of all Catholic citizens, whether natural-born or naturalized, in the trial through which our country and republican institutions are now passing. His Grace has appreciated the duty of the citizen, and also the true interests of the Church in the United States, and it would be difficult to over-estimate the service he has rendered by his letter, to both the Church and the state.

